



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/091,203

03/05/2002

Mingchi S. Mak

5681-10700

6376

7590

06/21/2006

Robert C. Kowert
Conley, Rose, & Tayon, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/091,203

Applicant(s)

MAK ET AL.

Examiner

Thong H. Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claims 1-32 are pending.
2. The co-pending applications are 10/90,893 and 10/091,204.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32, filed 5/22/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive to overcome the prior art.

A. Applicant argues the prior art does not teach "generates a format (examiner interprets the modified format, interim format as formats) for the small device document"

Examiner points out the prior art taught "the server sends form to client device (i.e.: PDA) in a suitable format" [Mansour, 0161]

B. Applicant argues the prior art does not teach "merging the content"

Examiner points out the prior art taught "merge the data"[Mansour, 0075].

Thus, the rejection is sustained.

Double Patenting

4. Claims 1-32 of this application conflict with claims 1-38 of Application No. 10/090,893. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11

Art Unit: 2142

F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-32 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-38 of copending Application No. 10/090893. This is a **provisional double patenting** rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

('893) Claim 1. A system comprising:

a server comprising a document in a format supported by the server, wherein the document is available to one or more devices via a network; a small device configured to couple to the server;

wherein the server is configured to generate a small device document in a format supported by the small device from the document in the format supported by the server;

wherein the small device is further configured to modify the small device document; and

wherein the server is further configured to synchronize the document in the format supported by the server with a modified version of the small device document on the small device.

('203. Claim 1). A system comprising:

a server configured to store documents in one or more server formats, wherein the documents are available to one or more devices via a network, wherein the server is configured to generate a small device document in a small device format from a document in a server format, wherein, to generate a small device document in a small device format from a document in a server format, the server is further configured to exclude one or more formats for content of the document in the server format from the small device document; and

wherein the server is further configured to provide the small device document to a small device coupled to the server; the small device, wherein the small device is configured to:

modify the small device document to produce a modified version of the small device document; and

provide the modified version of the small device document to the server; wherein the server is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the small device document, wherein, to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the small device document, the server is further configured to restore the one or more formats for content of the document in the server format excluded from the small device document.

(‘203. Claim 7). configured to resolve differences between the modified version of the document in the server format and another modified version of the document in the server format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mansour et al [Mansour 2002/0129096 A1].

5. As per claim 1, Mansour discloses A system comprising:

a server configured to store documents in one (or more) server format(s), wherein the documents are available to one (or more) device(s) via a network (i.e.: Internet), wherein the server is configured to generate a small device (i.e.: PDA) document in a client format from a document in a server format [Mansour, the client UI and server UI, 0022-0024; PDA, 0055], wherein, to generate a client document in a client format from a document in a server format, the server is further configured to exclude one or more formats for content of the document in the server format from the client document [Mansour, server versions, 0118];

wherein the server is further configured to provide the client document to a client device coupled to the server [Mansour, suitably configured, 0053];

the client wherein the small device is configured to:

modify the client document to produce a modified version of the client document and provide the modified version of the client document to the server [Mansour, updated version, 0185];

wherein the server is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the client document, wherein, to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the client document [Mansour, updated version, 0185], the server is further configured to restore the one (or more) format(s) for content of the document in

the server format excluded from the client document [Mansour, the UI server are configured to process and manipulate to perform different UI form for the client device, 0217; suitable configured, 0053-0218; restore or render format, 0218].

It was clearly that the UI server could manipulate the configured process by a suitable configured or restored the format in the server format excluded from the client document. Doing so would provide the flexibility to combine and merge the documents between the server- client formats by using any network devices.

6. As per claim 2, Mansour discloses the document in the server format is an office productivity document [Mansour, server versions, 0118].

7. As per claim 3, Mansour discloses restore the one or more formats for content of the document in the server format excluded from the small device document, the server is further configured to:

compare modified content of the modified version of the small device document to corresponding content of the document in the server format to determine one or more formats for the modified content of the modified version of the small device document to be merged with the document in the server format [Mansour, modified version, 0185; a comparison,0074]; and

merge the modified content of the modified version of the small device document into the document in the server format in accordance with the determined one or more formats for the modified content [Mansour, merge data, 0075].

8. As per claim 4, Mansour discloses determine differences between the modified version of the small device document and the document in the server format, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the small device document; and for each of the determined differences, merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the small device document with the document in the server format [Mansour, server versions, 0118]

9. As per claim 5, Mansour discloses generate a modified version of the small device document in the server format from the modified version of the small device document in the small device format; and compare the modified version of the small device document in the server format to the document in the server format [Mansour, updated version, 0185].

10. As per claim 6, Mansour discloses generate a modified document in an interim format from the modified version of the small device document; generate a document in the interim format from the document in the server format [Mansour, server versions, 0118];

determine one or more differences between the modified document in the interim format and the document in the interim format [Mansour, different form, 0217];

for each of the determined differences, merge corresponding changed content of the modified document in the interim format with the document in the interim format; and

generate the modified version of the document in the server format from the document in the interim format [Mansour, converted and merge, 0075].

11. As per claim 7, Mansour discloses the server is further configured to resolve differences between the modified version of the document in the server format and another modified version of the document in the server format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format [Mansour, updated version, 0185].

12. As per claim 8, Mansour discloses display the differences between the modified version of the document and the other modified version of the document [Mansour, display in comparison, 0074]; and for each difference, accept user input specifying which version is to be used in the synchronized version of the document [Mansour, updated version, 0185].

13. As per claim 9, Mansour discloses determine one of the policies (i.e.: version) corresponding to the difference; and apply the determined policy to the difference to determine which version is to be used in the synchronized version of the document [Mansour, updated version, 0185].

14. Claims 10-32 contain the similar limitations set for claims 1-9. Therefore claims 10-32 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claims 1-9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ketonen et al [Ketonen 7,035,828 B2] in view of Mousseau et al [Mousseau 6,477,529 B1].

15. As per claim 1, Ketonen discloses A system comprising:

a server configured to store documents in one (or more) server format(s), wherein the documents are available to one (or more) device(s) via a network (i.e.: Internet), wherein the server is configured to generate a small device (i.e.: PDA) document in a client format from a document in a server format, wherein, to generate a client document in a client format from a document in a server format, the server is further configured to exclude one or more formats for content of the document in the server format from the client document [Ketonen, the mini-server generates a response HTML document which provides the status information in a format which can be displayed on a Palm device, col 21 lines 5-40];

wherein the server is further configured to provide the client document to a client device coupled to the server; the client wherein the small device is configured to:

modify the client document to produce a modified version of the client document and provide the modified version of the client document to the server [Ketonen, local assistant Client-side customization application, the modified status, col 11 lines 30-50];

wherein the server is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the client document, wherein, to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the client document, [Ketonen, the mini-server generates a response HTML document or modified document which provides the status information in a format which can be displayed on a Palm device, col 21 lines 5-40].

However Ketonen does not explicitly detail:

the server is further configured to restore the one (or more) format(s) for content of the document in the server format excluded from the client document,

In the same endeavor, Mousseau discloses an apparatus and method for dynamically limiting information sent to a viewing device including an information translator on gateway/server exchanging data to the client handheld device [Mousseau, col 3 line 55-col 4 line 8]

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the merging new content data, commands as taught by Mousseau into the Ketonen's apparatus in order to utilize the Client-Side Customization application. Doing so would provide a dynamic control over what information is transmitted to the wireless device [Mousseau, col 2 lines 20-22].

16. As per claim 2, Ketonen-Mousseau disclose the document in the server format is an office productivity document [Ketonen, HTML document, col 21 lines 5-40].

17. As per claim 7, Ketonen-Mousseau disclose the server is further configured to resolve differences between the modified version of the document in the server format and another modified version of the document in the server format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format [Ketonen, synchronizing, col 1 lines 15-25].

18. As per claim 8, Ketonen-Mousseau disclose display the differences between the modified version of the document and the other modified version of the document; and for each difference, accept user input specifying which version is to be used in the synchronized version of the document [Ketonen, synchronizing, col 1 lines 15-25].

19. As per claim 9, Ketonen-Mousseau disclose determine one of the policies (i.e.: version) corresponding to the difference; and apply the determined policy to the difference to determine which version is to be used in the synchronized version of the document [Ketonen, synchronizing, col 1 lines 15-25].

20. Claims 10,16-18;19,24-26;27 and 32 contain the identical limitations set for claims 1-2,7-9 respectively. Therefore claims 10,16-18;19, 24-26;27 and 32 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claims 1-2,7-9.

21. As per claim 3, Ketonen-Mousseau disclose compare modified content of the modified version of the small device document to corresponding content of the document in the server format to determine one or more formats for the modified content of the modified version of the small device document to be merged with the document in the server format [Ketonen, the broker searches for matching information, col 17 lines 34-48]; and merge the modified content of the modified version of the small device document into the document in the server format in accordance with the determined one or more formats for the modified content [Mousseau, merging the new content, col 10 lines 1-20; col 9 lines 1-15]

22. As per claim 4, Ketonen-Mousseau disclose determine differences between the modified version of the small device document and the document in the server format, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the small device document; and for each of the determined differences, merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the small device document with the document in the server format [Mousseau, merging the new content, col 10 lines 1-20; col 9 lines 1-15].

23. As per claim 5, Ketonen-Mousseau disclose generate a modified version of the small device document in the server format from the modified version of the small device document in the small device format; and compare the modified version of the

small device document in the server format to the document in the server format
[Ketonen, data matching, col 2 lines 42-53].

24. As per claim 6, Ketonen-Mousseau disclose generate a modified document in an interim format from the modified version of the small device document;

generate a document in the interim format from the document in the server format; determine one or more differences between the modified document in the interim format and the document in the interim format; for each of the determined differences, merge corresponding changed content of the modified document in the interim format with the document in the interim format; and generate the modified version of the document in the server format from the document in the interim format
[Mousseau, merging the new content, col 10 lines 1-20; col 9 lines 1-15].

25. Claims 12-15,20-23,28-31 contain the identical limitations set for claims 3-6. Therefore, claims 12-15,20-23,28-31 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claims 3-6.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-2003/0105816 A1 Goswami.

-2002/0085534 A1 Williams et al.

-2006/0074780 A1 Taylor et al.

-2005/0120082 A1 Hesselink et al.

Art Unit: 2142

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thong Vu*, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:00AM-3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Andrew Caldwell* can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thong Vu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2142

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thong Vu', with a horizontal line underneath.